

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-23 are currently pending, of which Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, and 20-23 are independent claims. The Description of the Related Art of the specification has been amended to more clearly describe a prior art. No amendments have been made to the pending claims.

In the Office Action mailed April 23, 2007, the Examiner maintained his former position that Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by JP 11-259390 to Nakano Toshiaki ("Nakano") or alternatively, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,047,327 to Tso et al. ("Tso") in view of Nakano, and Claims 18-19 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,506 to Obradovich et al. ("Obradovich") or alternatively, over Tso in view of Nakano and further in view of Obradovich. For at least the reasons stated below, the grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed as follows.

Applicants thanks Examiner Dalencourt for his courtesy extended to the Applicants' representative in a telephone interview on August 23, 2007. The summary of the interview is incorporated hereinafter.

Claim 1 recites an email sending and receiving system comprising, among other things, a positional data storage section for storing a plurality of physical positional data, wherein the positional data storage section includes a plurality of physical positional data registered by an addresser and a positional data attaching section for attaching

one or more of the physical positional data corresponding to the receipt of a selected location at the web page, wherein the location is stored in the positional data storage section to the e-mail message generated by the mail generating section. Similar features of Claim 1 are also recited in Claim 9.

Claim 6 recites an e-mail sending and receiving system comprising, among other things, a positional data storage section for storing a plurality of physical positional data, and a position data attaching section for attaching one or more of the physical positional data stored in the positional data storage section to the e-mail message generated by the mail generating section, and a detailed data generating section for generating detailed data relating to each physical positional data attached to the e-mail message, and attaching a URL for accessing the detailed data to an e-mail message. Similar features of Claim 6 are also recited in Claim 14.

Claim 17 recites an e-mail sending and receiving system comprising, among other things, means for searching by map image, means for searching by location name; means for searching by category of location; means for searching by course name among location names registered in advance by the user; and means for searching by course name among course names registered in advance by the user.

The e-mail sending and receiving system of Claims 20 and 21 recite, among other things, the mail generating section generates each e-mail message by using a format suitable for the communication terminal of the addressee, so that the communication terminal can read the e-mail message, and wherein the communication terminal of the addressee is a car navigation system.

Finally, the e-mail sending and receiving system of Claims 22 and 23 recite, among other things, a positional data attaching section for setting one of the physical positional data stored in the positional data storage section to the e-mail message generated by the mail generating section, and a destination setting section for setting one of the physical positional data attached to a received e-mail as a destination.

It is respectfully none of Nakano, Tso, and Obradovich, when taken singly or in combination, teaches or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17, and 20-23.

Prior to argue the differences of the cited references, Applicants first respectfully submit that the computer-translated English version of the Nakano reference is not an accurate translation. To avoid misunderstanding the content of Nakano, Applicants have submitted a correct translation of portions of the Nakano reference at an attachment. Applicants also have submitted a Certificate of Translation signed by Mr. Nobuhiko Ikeda to declare the accuracy of the translation. The submitted translation includes paragraphs [0005], [0011], [0016], [0020]-[0026], and [0041]-[0055].

102(a) rejection:

Nakano describes a system and a method for transmitting electronic mail (i.e., e-mail) with image data. As described in paragraphs [0042]-[0052], a user A at a terminal A sends an e-mail with map information to a user B at a terminal B. To begin with, the user A displays a map image which he or she desires to send to the user B. The user A then clicks a mail processing button 38 to send the positional information of the currently displayed map image to a WWW server 22 comprising a link URL of the HTML text. The WWW server 22 then selects a map file from a map database 14 and stores

the map file with a file name. Next, the WWW server 22 creates HTML texts containing the file name of the image data and sends them to the user A. The user A then downloads the map image received from the WWW server 22 and, if necessary, can enter any handwriting on the map image. The map image and handwriting are then composed in an email, which is then transmitted the user B by the user A. As described in paragraph [0053] of Nakano, the e-mail received by the user B would contains e-mail message 50 and a map image data 42, as shown in Fig. 7. Clearly, the e-mail received by the user B contains only a map image with/without handwriting. The map image data 42 is not a URL link.

The Examiner maintained that Nakano, as shown in paragraph [0022], teaches a map server 12 that “search and acquires the image data of map information which corresponds according to the assignment from a user terminal” (translated from a computer generated translation machine.) However, in the correct translation, paragraph [0022] should be read as “map server 12 searches and acquires the map data of the corresponding map information from the map database 14 as designated or instructed from the user terminal, and sends the data to the user terminal via the internet 15.” Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that paragraph [0022] of Nakano merely teaches that a user inputs instructions for searching the map information and fails to teach or suggest the map database 14 including a plurality of physical positional data registered by a user, as claimed in Claims 1 and 9. Nakano also fails to teach or suggest at least a means for searching by course name among location names registered in advance by the user; and a means for searching by course name among course names registered in advance by the user, as recited in Claim 17.

Similarly, The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 6 and 14, asserting that when User B opens the attached URL, that detailed information is displayed upon clicking on the URL. Applicants respectfully disagree. From paragraph [0053] of Nakano, the e-mail received by the user B only contains an image data. No URL is ever sent to the user B. Furthermore, even if an URL were attached to the e-mail, the URL relates to the electronic location of the website or of the map, it does not relate to "physical" positional data attached to the e-mail. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Nakano fails to teach or suggest at least a detailed data generating section for generating detailed data relating to each physical positional data attached to the e-mail message, and attaching a URL for accessing the detailed data to an e-mail message, as recited in Claims 6 and 14.

It is also respectfully submitted that Nakano fails to teach or suggest at least a positional data attaching section for setting one of the physical positional data stored in the positional data storage section to the e-mail message generated by the mail generating section, and a destination setting section for setting one of the physical positional data attached to a received e-mail as a destination, as recited in Claims 22-23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17, and 22-23 are not anticipated by Nakano under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and are patentable at least for the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Claims 3-5, 7-8, 11-13, and 15-16 are also patentable at least due to their dependencies from patentable independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 14.

103(a) Rejection:

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 20 and 21, asserting that the combination of Obradovich and Nakano teach the idea of an e-mail message using a format suitable for a car navigation system. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Nakano only teaches e-mail messages using a format suitable for receipt at a user's computer terminal. On the other hand, Obradovich teaches an automobile system capable of receiving low-frequency low-power broadcasts providing a GPS map or a local directory. Thus, Nakano merely teaches an e-mail system for sending e-mails to another e-mail system, and Obradovich merely teaches a car system for receiving area-wide broadcasts. Therefore, neither Nakano nor Obradovich teaches formatting e-mails for receipt by a car navigation system. That is, none of Nakano and Obradovich discloses or suggests at least an e-mail generating section that generates each e-mail message by using a format suitable for the communication terminal of the addressee, so that the communication terminal can read the e-mail message, and wherein the communication terminal of the addressee is a car navigation system, as recited in amended claims 20 and 21.

Furthermore, as described above, neither Nakano nor Obradovich teaches or suggests a positional data storage section for storing a plurality of physical positional data, as recited in Claims 20 and 21. Therefore, it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine these references to achieve the systems of Claims 20-21. Accordingly, Claims 20 and 21 should be patentable over Nakano in view of Obradovich.

In the alternative, Claims 1-17, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,047,327 to Tso et al. ("Tso") in view of Nakano; and Claims 18-19 as being unpatentable over Tso in view of Nakano and further in view of Obradovich.

Tso describes a server automatically distributing electronic information to a targeted group of users, depending on information contained in the profile of the receiver. (See column 1 lines 48-50 and column 2 lines 40-43). Tso does not teach the receipt of information at a web page, which is used to attach location information to an e-mail message.

Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit that neither Tso nor Nakano disclose or suggest an e-mail sending and receiving system where each e-mail is written on a web page provided by a communications center, the system comprising a positional data storage section, wherein the positional data storage section includes a plurality of physical positional data registered by an addresser, as recited in Claims 1 and 9.

The Office Action cites column 4, lines 33-48 of Tso as teaching the claimed positional data storage section including a plurality of physical positional data registered by an addresser. In this section, Tso merely teaches that positional information on "users" is stored in a server. However, in Tso, the "users" are the recipients of generated mail, not the addressers and the users do not register a plurality of physical positional data.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 9 should be patentable over Tso in view of Nakano. As Claims 1 and 9 are patentable,

the Applicants submit that Claims 3-5, 7-8, 11-13, 15-16, and 17-19, which depend from patentable Claims 1 and 9, are likewise patentable.

With regards to the rejection of Claims 6 and 11, Applicants respectively submit that neither Nakano nor Tso disclose or suggest an e-mail sending and receiving system for sending and receiving e-mail between communication terminals, including a detailed data generating section for generating detailed data relating to each physical positional data attached to the e-mail message, and attaching a URL for accessing the detailed data to the e-mail message; and a positional data register section for storing the detailed data in the positional data storage section according to a request from the communication terminal of the addressee, as recited in Claims 6 and 14.

As discussed above, Nakano does not disclose or suggest an e-mail sending and receiving system including at least this feature.

The Office Action cites column 6, lines 5-20 of Tso as teaching these claimed features. However, Tso merely teaches a database containing pointers associated with a fully qualified URL. The database is essentially a lookup table for determining which pointers are associated with which URL. Tso does not disclose or suggest generating detailed data relating to each physical positional data attached to the e-mail message, and attaching a URL for accessing the detailed data to the e-mail message. Additionally, Tso does not disclose or suggest a positional data register section for storing the detailed data in the positional data storage section according to a request from the communication terminal of the addressee

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectively submit that Claims 6 and 14 should be patentable over Tso in view of Nakano.

With regards to the rejection of Claims 20 and 21, the Examiner admits that neither Tso nor Nakano disclose or suggest generating an e-mail message by using a format suitable for a car navigation system. The Office Action relies on Obradovich for this feature.

As discussed above, Obradovich does not disclose or suggest an e-mail sending and receiving system including at least a mail generating section that generates each e-mail message by using a format suitable for the communication terminal of the addressee, so that the communication terminal can read the e-mail message, and wherein the communication terminal of the addressee is a car navigation system, as recited in Claims 20 and 21.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectively submit that Claims 20 and 21 should be patentable over Tso in view of Nakano in view of Obradovich.

With regards to the rejection of Claims 22 and 23, although the Office Action does not address the reasons for rejection of these claims, the Applicants submit that neither Tso nor Nakano disclose or suggest at least the feature of a destination setting section for setting one of the physical positional data attached to a received e-mail message as a destination, as recited in Claims 22 and 23

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 22 and 23 should be patentable over Tso in view of Nakano.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket No. 107439-00027.

Respectfully submitted,



Wan-Ching Montfort
Registration No. 56,127

Customer No. 004372
Arent Fox LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 715-8492
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810


Enclosure: An English translation of JP 11-259390 (Nakano) including a Certificate of Translation

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/739,397
Attorney Docket No. 107439-00027

Certificate of Translation

I, Nobuhiko Ikeda, do hereby declare as follows:

- (1) I fully understand the Japanese and English language; and
- (2) the English translation of Japanese Patent Application No. JP 11-259390 (first inventor: Nakano Toshiaki) was made by me and is an accurate translation of the Japanese application.


Nobuhiko Ikeda

September 13, 2007
Date